

spinoff properties to make up the deficit? In view of Chalk's past "crisis" tactics, it is quite apparent that he is deliberately trying to precipitate a strike to force the Congress to deliver the subsidy. He has used these tactics before with Congress, all too successfully.

The market value of the properties which Chalk has spun off plus those which he is attempting to spin off is estimated to be in the neighborhood of \$18 million. Add to that the approximately \$5 million in dividends which the company has paid to the stockholders. The majority stockholder is, of course, himself. Add to all that the approximately \$70,000 in salaries which Chalk annually pays to himself and his wife. In sum, Chalk has milked the company dry and incurred company indebtedness to a point where the net worth of D.C. Transit is zero.

Now, with the property worth nothing, Chalk wants a generous subsidy to be used to keep the company going and, incredibly, to reinstate dividends of approximately \$600,000 per year.

Indisputably, Chalk has duped the public and the Congress much too long. The company and the franchise should be taken from his responsibility post haste without a penny of further compensation.

Furthermore, the city and the regulatory Commission should be diligent in recovering for the company and the public the properties which Chalk has siphoned off.

WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT

(Mr. COUGHLIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying that this House yesterday passed the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 by a vote of 392 to 1.

Although I was present yesterday for the debate in support of the bill, I was called from the floor for an appointment and my return was delayed until after the rollcall was complete. Had I been present I would have voted yea.

Nothing is more important than the conservation of our precious natural resources. Actual pollution and the threat of even more disastrous pollution of our water resources have become intolerable. It behooves industry, as well as the private citizen, to recognize that despoiling of our natural assets must be stemmed and eventually stopped before we have so debauched these resources that all of us will have suffered irreparable harm.

Industry and the private citizen could not enjoy the benefits of today's American society had we not been blessed with the huge reservoir of natural resources nature entrusted to us as a nation. The time has long passed when we can cite the materialistic accomplishments of our technological age as excuses for the crimes we have perpetrated against our natural resources.

In this quest to save our environment from pollution beyond recall, each of us

must assume his responsibility—individually or corporately—for doing his utmost to reverse the unfortunate trend of past decades. The Water Quality Control Act of 1969 is a logical and reasonable effort to help reverse this trend. I would hope that all concerned abide by and consciously act to make this measure every bit as effective as we intend it to be.

COMMENTS ON THE JENSEN ARTICLE ON INTELLIGENCE

(Mr. WHITEHURST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, recently the Harvard Educational Review carried a 100-page report written by Dr. Arthur Jensen, School of Education at Berkeley. This article deals with the problems of heredity and environment as determinants of an individual's IQ. Some sections of this report have been publicly evaluated out of context.

In response to these evaluations, the Washington Post recently carried two articles by Dr. William F. Brazziel, the director of general education at Norfolk State College. These articles, dated March 21, and April 8, 1969, not only brought the context to bear on these evaluations, but also included additional comments by the author, Dr. Jensen.

Mr. Speaker, I feel Dr. Brazziel's articles have much merit and should be called to the attention of my colleagues. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted into the Record immediately following my remarks.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 21, 1969]

THE JENSEN ARTICLE ON INTELLIGENCE

Joseph Alsop's analysis of Arthur Jensen's article on intelligence (March 12) deserves comment. There seems to be a great deal of confusion about what Jensen said, what he was actually trying to say and even about who Jensen is. From what I can glean from correspondence with Dr. Jensen, he feels he is being misinterpreted—at least by the Klan types who are embracing him as their very own.

1. Jensen is not a professor in the department of educational psychology at Berkeley. He is a professor in the School of Education.

2. Jensen's 100-page article in the *Harvard Educational Review* did not deal solely with black-white differences in IQ. Only three pages dealt with race. He should have known, however, that these three pages would make the headlines and that his real story would remain untold—at least by the mass media. Ironically, his thesis could have been presented without the treatment of race. These three pages could have been omitted.

3. In the spring issue of *HER*, four eminent psychologists will rebut, or place in what they consider proper perspective, Jensen's contentions regarding heredity versus environment in IQ. It was a grave editorial blunder to postpone comment until spring. The contentions and the rebuttals should have been placed back-to-back.

4. Jensen's main thesis was that heredity plays a major role in all IQ and that the "environmentalists" (this is an extension of an old-age feud) were leading people astray

by over-promising and under-producing in their Head Start, compensatory and mental retardation programs.

5. Significantly, Jensen also stated on the last two pages of his article that IQ tests do not tap the full capabilities of disadvantaged black kids. He stated that he had developed a test which showed better than most their true potentials.

6. He noted that these kids rely heavily on old-fashioned associative learning similar to that taught by basic educationists of the 1930's and that the source of failure of compensatory education lay in the fact that since Sputnik I most American teachers relied heavily on abstract conceptions. He urged a greater individualization of instruction and a shift to highly intensive instructional methods such as the Bereiter-Engelmann program. He said the programs of art and music for the "culturally deprived" were a waste of money.

7. On race, Jensen stated that a higher proportion of black than white children were apt to have been malnourished, under-stimulated and under-educated and that self concepts and learning were affected by 3.5 centuries of isolation and bigotry. And that of these factors all combined to produce low IQ's. He noted that families who were affected most by these conditions also had the large families, that the black middle class families with high IQ's had small families. He implied that unless some food, money, jobs and family planning or selective breeding entered the picture any statistical portrait of black IQ would be low and place black people in a bad light. In fact, the statistics would get worse. All of this has been said before.

8. In leading up to these conclusions which in general are quite sound and deserve attention. Jensen winnowed through 40 years of research on black-white IQ, all of which was inconclusive. He came to the same conclusion of most physiologists in this area, i.e., black people seem to think in a different fashion from white people, our present tests (his new test excluded) don't measure the black mind correctly and we have no way of ascertaining how much of this difference is genetic and how much is environmental.

Extremists and self-anointed psychologists seem to be seizing upon the report as medicine for whatever ails them. It has already been used in a school desegregation case—for the defense. New York black nationalists are pleased to learn that black people think differently from white people etc. They consider it a blessing. The list is much longer. Few people have actually read the article.

Someone should try to bring some order to the situation—right now. There are good implications in the article for policy planning in school integration, compensatory education, anti-hunger and family planning programs, and for the new programs of infant stimulation such as are now in progress in the NIH complex and OEO demonstration centers. It would be shameful to let the thing slide into another Moynihan affair.

WILLIAM F. BRAZZIEL,
Director of General Education, Virginia State College.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 8, 1969]

FURTHER COMMENT ON THE JENSEN ARTICLE

Joseph Alsop's analysis of my letter on the Jensen article deserves comment. I was happy to see Mr. Alsop indicate that the main thesis of Dr. Jensen's article was the hereditary-environment controversy and that, contrary to the impression many people received from his columns, black IQ was not the central theme. Whether three or 16 pages of the article directly dealt with racial differences can be debated but is probably not important here.

In Mr. Alsop's columns on the matter the

most troublesome statement seems to have been: "Yet there is no use being mealy mouthed about it. Dr. Jensen is really saying that in addition to the handicaps wickedly imposed by prejudice and discrimination, the average black American begins the race of life with a detectable genetic handicap." This statement sent many hard-line segregationists into orbit.

In my request for clarification from Dr. Jensen regarding his views on racial inferiority in intellect, I received a letter with the following statements:

1. Obvious differences in inborn mental ability between races are reporters' words, they are certainly not mine. Furthermore, the statement is quite indefensible.

2. The complex causes of differences in mental abilities among individuals or between racial groups are not at all obvious. Research so far has been inadequate as a basis for definitive conclusions about racial differences in intelligence.

3. My own work is not aimed at this aspect of the problem but at the description and analysis of individual differences in various types of learning.

I want also to express disappointment with Mr. Alsop's decision to withhold analysis of the rebuttals of the article although he had them in hand when he wrote the column. He is engaging in the same questionable practices which many persons are now taking the *Harvard Education Review* editorial board to task for.

Fortunately, the *New York Times* saw fit to release the gist of the rebuttals in their Sunday, March 30 paper. Professor Steven Vandenberg, a University of Colorado geneticist, said that Dr. Jensen's interpretation may have been overzealous and that Jensen should have been more careful about the racial question. Dr. Lee Cronback, a University of Pittsburgh psychologist, accused Jensen of overstatement and misstatement, and Dr. J. McVicker Hunt, a University of Illinois psychologist, said that odds are strong that we can boost both IQ and scholastic achievement substantially. There was dissent in this vein from several others. Most people will never learn about it, however, because of the way the article and the rebuttals were handled.

I think Mr. Alsop is on the right track in urging that we assure good nutrition, prenatal care, early stimulation, early education and the best of schools for all children from homes with modest incomes.

I believe this will result in a reduction in the learning problems we are all concerned about. We might also buy Dr. Jensen's new test which he claims will tap the potential of poor children far better than any devised so far.

I surely hope we can avoid arguing among ourselves until we can get this job done.

WILLIAM F. BRAZZIEL, Ph. D.,
Director of General Education,
Virginia State College.

NORFOLK.

ALONG WITH THE SURTAX

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my mail is very heavy from constituents on tax matters. Probably, people are more concerned about heavy taxes and tax inequities than any other domestic matter. We will be faced soon with a decision as to whether the 10-percent surtax should be extended, reduced or eliminated entirely. My vote will be to eliminate the surtax and to eliminate the need for it by reducing expenditures.

The Free Lance-Star, a newspaper

published in Fredericksburg, Va., contained an editorial recently regarding the surtax which gives the editor's opinion of the surtax which I believe merits our consideration.

Certainly, the Ways and Means Committee has a difficult task in recommending ways to eliminate inequities in the system and providing that each citizen pay his fair share of the tax burden. I believe they will make progress in this respect.

The editorial is inserted herein for the information of the House.

[From the Fredericksburg (Va.) Free Lance-Star, Apr. 14, 1969]

ALONG WITH THE SURTAX

One hears more and more variations on the theme that, while we must retain the 10 per cent surcharge on income tax, this should be accompanied by significant tax reform. The point is well taken. Congress can scarcely justify keeping the surtax, which falls as such a burden on middle-income taxpayers, without acting against devices whereby the rich get by without paying a fair share of taxes.

It is sometimes argued, though rather lamely, that this is not really much of a problem because the rich are small in number. This attitude was disclosed in recent testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee by Walker Winter, vice president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He told the congressmen that "too much emphasis has been placed on the relatively small number of taxpayers who have arranged their affairs so as to minimize their tax liabilities."

If Congress heeds this siren song, it may find that talk of a "taxpayers' revolt" has become more than talk. For if there is one thing that galls the average taxpayer is the thought that, whereas he must dig deep, some huge corporations and some enormously wealthy men pay little or no taxes.

An article published recently in many newspapers called attention to the fact that last year 21 Americans with incomes of a million dollars or more paid no taxes whatsoever. The fact that this taxless status also applied to about 150 with incomes in excess of \$200,000 has been well publicized, too. These are extreme examples—but examples of a fairly common phenomenon, evasion of proportionate income taxes by corporations and wealthy individuals.

It is a phenomenon that the American people increasingly feel they would like to dispense with. That is something for Congress to consider with care when debating whether to retain the 10 percent surtax.

INFLAMMATORY REMARKS BY JULIUS HOBSON, WASHINGTON SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I note from the news media that Julius W. Hobson, an employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, made a recent talk before a group of Georgetown University students and indicated that he was a Marxist Socialist who believes that the American free enterprise system must be overthrown by force and violence before the gap can be bridged between the Nation's haves and have-nots.

It seems to me that if anyone overthrows the American free enterprise system by force and violence, it would be

tantamount to the overthrow of the U.S. Government and I am writing to the Department of Justice suggesting that it try to ascertain the full text of the Hobson statement, investigate his other activities, and determine whether he is violating any criminal statute. Since he is also a Government employee, I am also contacting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine whether this is a suitable person to be on the Government payroll, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to determine whether Mr. Hobson has violated any civil service laws or regulations.

It seems unreasonable to me for a man to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of this country and still be on the payroll of that Government.

His speech also states that Washington students have nothing to lose by raising hell, even if they take over control and occupy schools; that nothing more can happen to them and they have nothing to lose by such activity. This raises the question as to whether he is inciting people to riot in conflict with Federal and District of Columbia law.

Approximately 1 year ago, prior to the so-called Poor Peoples' March on Washington, Mr. Hobson complained of Federal discrimination in employment and circulated a petition among Federal employees seeking congressional hearings. He stated at that time that in the event officials did not respond favorably to the petition, he would consider civil disobedience tactics in Federal buildings.

After learning of this, I contacted the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Attorney General, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, urging investigation and the taking of appropriate action against the offender. Nothing was done by the Johnson administration. It will be interesting to learn whether the present administration takes any action against this militant on the Federal payroll and the use of seditious language by a self-styled Marxist Socialist.

THE RUSSIAN FISHING OFFENSIVE

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today I flew in a Coast Guard plane out over a group of some 100 Russian fishing trawlers busy at work in the Atlantic off the coast near Norfolk, Va.

The trawlers themselves are supported by at least seven large factory ships which process the catch right there on the scene. I also saw a refrigerated freighter which carries the product either back to Russia for home consumption or to Latin America or elsewhere for sale.

I am informed that I saw only about half of the Russian vessels now operating off our Atlantic coasts. And I understand also that some 25 Polish trawlers are fishing in the same area.

Some of the Russian trawlers from the fleet I saw had violated the American